



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/785,207

02/20/2001

Kunihiko Iizuka

1046.1240 (JDH)

3957

21171

7590

01/29/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

SUITE 700

1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,207

Applicant(s)

IIZUKA, KUNIHIKO

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menendez et al., U.S. Patent 5,555,369 (hereinafter referred to as Menendez) in view of May, U.S. Patent 6,421,653.

Menendez discloses a program development device developing an application program by use of a component having a plurality of interfaces, comprising:

In regard to claim 1:

a component selecting module having said component selected;

Menendez discloses a component selection module (column 2, lines 35 – 45; column 14, lines 42 – 47; e.g., Figure 8).

an interface selection module having said interface selected for said selected component, and setting said selected interface in a valid or invalid state;

Menendez discloses an interface selection module (column 2, lines 35 – 45; column 14, lines 50 – 54). The component interface is interpreted as valid when it is selected and viewed in the test layout (e.g., see Figure 8).

a recording unit retaining a set record of having set said interface in the valid or invalid state;

Menendez does not specifically record valid and invalid interfaces. However, May discloses the use of a class group modification interface that determines unassigned (invalid) and assigned (valid) groups (column 28, lines 44 – 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the component and interface selection module as taught by Menendez with the class group modification interface taught by May, because the combination provides a means for the Menendez invention to keep a record of the valid and invalid interfaces available by selecting a group (or component) and thereby providing a list of valid and invalid members of the group (or interfaces) as taught by May (column 28, lines 48 – 50).

a edit module supporting the development of the program by use of said interface set in the valid state or said interface that is not set in the invalid state in accordance with the set record.

Menendez discloses an edit module for editing the script underlying the selected component interface (column 15, lines 44 – 47).

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...further comprising a specifying module specifying one of the plurality of set records, wherein said edit module supports the development of the program by use of said interface set in the valid state in the specified set record or said interface that is not set in the invalid state.”

Menendez discloses an edit module for editing the script underlying the selected component interface (column 15, lines 44 – 47).

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“a group definition module defining a group consisting of a plurality of users;”

“a group specifying module specifying a usable set record with respect to the group.”

Menendez discloses a module defining a group of usable components, but does not disclose a group consisting of a plurality of users or record with respect to the group. However, May discloses a class group modification interface that determines unassigned (invalid) and assigned (valid) groups of valid entities (users) and usable records (column 28, lines 32 – 59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the component and interface selection module as taught by Menendez with the class group modification interface taught by May, because the combination provides a means for the Menendez invention to select usable records with respect to a group by customizing the groups with addition and deletion of group members as taught by May (column 28, lines 45 – 48).

In regard to claim 4:

A program development device developing an application program by combining components having a plurality of interfaces, comprising:

a layout component selection module selecting said layout component which lays out a plurality of components to be laid out;

Menendez discloses a component layout module (column 14, lines 42 – 60; e.g., Figures 8 and 9).

a laid-out component selection module selecting said component to be laid out in said selected layout component;

Art Unit: 2124

Menendez discloses a component selection module (column 14, lines 42 – 60; e.g., Figures 8 and 9).

a prescribing module prescribing a layout specification for laying out said laid-out components;

Menendez discloses a layout prescribing module employing an editor to layout a window (column 10, lines 20 – 55; e.g., Figures 12 – 14).

a recording unit retaining a layout specification record of the prescribed layout specification;

Menendez discloses that the layout is recorded by selecting the “Add Window” menu selection (column 10, lines 41 – 54).

a edit module supporting a development of the program by laying out said laid-out components in said layout component in accordance with the layout specification record.

Menendez discloses a layout module employing an editor to layout a window and modify the view (column 10, lines 20 – 55; e.g., Figures 12 – 14).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 4:

“...further comprising a specification designating module designating one of a plurality of layout specification records,

wherein said edit module supports the development of the program by use of the layout specification prescribed in the designated layout specification record.”

Menendez discloses that the layout can be edited (column 15, lines 42 – 55; e.g., Figures 10 – 14).

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 4:

“...further comprising:

*a group definition module defining a group consisting of a plurality of users; and
a specification designating module designating the layout specification record
usable for the group. ”*

Menendez discloses a module defining a group of usable components, but does not disclose a group consisting of a plurality of users or record with respect to the group. However, May discloses a class group modification interface that determines unassigned (invalid) and assigned (valid) groups of valid entities (users) and usable records (column 28, lines 32 – 59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the component and interface selection module as taught by Menendez with the class group modification interface taught by May, because the combination provides a means for the Menendez invention to select usable records with respect to a group by customizing the groups with addition and deletion of group members as taught by May (column 28, lines 45 – 48).

In regard to claim 7 (a method), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 (a corresponding device).

In regard to claim 8 (a method), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 4 (a corresponding device).

In regard to claim 9 (a computer-readable medium), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 7 (a corresponding method).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 10 (a computer-readable medium), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 8 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 11 (a communication signal containing code), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 7 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 12 (a communication signal containing code), rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 8 (a device).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 5,850,548 to Williams, regarding visual programming of components.

U.S. Patent 5,897,635 to Torres et al., regarding a customized user interface using window functionality to add, delete, and modify application information.

U.S. Patent 6,232,968 to Alimpich et al., regarding providing application programs with multiple selectable user interfaces.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

Art Unit: 2124

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

January 14, 2003



KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100